MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 November 1967
INDEX

ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting 1

2. Approval of Minutes of October 1967 Meeting 1

3. Kingsman Elementary School 1

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

   Discussion of Height of Building No. 1, Watergate 2

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden 2

   b. F.B.I. Building - Confirmation of Approved Design 2-3

   c. Pennsylvania Avenue Annex and Great Plaza Parking Facilities 3

   d. Selection of Sculptor for Courthouse and Federal Office Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 3

3. Department of the Navy

   Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia 3-4

4. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

   Arlington National Cemetery 4-5

5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

   Elementary School, Lincoln Road & Douglas Place, N.E. 5

6. Department of Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

   Medal Commemorating 100th Anniversary of the First Transcontinental Railroad (Golden Spike Society) 5

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 68-19, 900 Maine Avenue, S.W. - Floating Restaurant 5

(2) Watergate Development, Stage IV, Building 5 5-6

(3) Appendix 1 6

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Appendix 2 6

INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden 6-7

2. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia 7

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery 7-8

4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas Place 8

5. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

Discussion of height of Building 1, Watergate 8-9

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular montly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 14 November 1967. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor
NCPC: Richard Huff
Recorder: Leone Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday-Wednesday, 19-20 December 1967 were approved. If a one-day meeting is required, Wednesday, the 20th was chosen. Tuesday - Wednesday, 16-17 January 1968 were tentatively selected for the following month.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 1967 Meeting

The members approved the minutes of the October meeting.

3. Kingsman Elementary School (Added)

The Secretary stated that Lawrence Halprin, landscape architect, had been requested by the Committee for a More Beautiful Capital to develop a scheme for the erroded slope surrounding this school. The Commission's comments were requested.

A photograph indicated a design consisting of terraced steps, play sculpture, and parapet. The Secretary noted that the plan affected only half the front slope and the adjoining side area. He mentioned that the community reaction had been polled and the plan was enthusiastically received. Joining the sidewalk area and the school grounds into/public area was thought to be a particularly good idea. The Commission generally liked the plan and authorized the Secretary to report its reaction to the White House through Sharon Francis of Mrs. Johnson's staff.

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

Discussion of Height of Building No. 1, Watergate Development

The Chairman Stated that Roger Stevens, Chairman of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, had requested to appear before the Commission and present as Chairman of the Kennedy Center its side in the controversy. Stevens and representatives of the Watergate Development were scheduled to attend the afternoon session.

The members decided they would not reconsider their statement of 21 September 1967 unless any new information were submitted. They agreed that no further action was necessary until after Stevens made his presentation.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room during the discussion. A site model, renderings and drawings of the plaza area and museum were submitted - also a sample of travertine to be used as exterior material.

Revisions included a reduction in the size of the plaza area and the cross Mall sculpture garden retaining wall which was lowered to 12 feet and made a uniform height. The pool had been depressed which would permit a continuous visual sweep of the Mall. The entire garden area was simplified. A perspective of the coffered ceiling showed the massive concrete web of supporting members resting on four hollow piers which served as circulation cores to the upper floors.

In discussing these revisions the members were concerned with lighting and landscape plans for the entire scheme, paving material and pattern for the plaza, parking facilities, and methods of preventing stains on the exterior of the building, specifically along the cornice line and under the balcony.

The members agreed to present these comments to representatives of the architectural firm when they appeared later.

b. F.B.I. Building - Confirmation of Approved Design by C.F. Murphy Associates.

Photographs of four elevation drawings were reviewed for confirmation of approval of the design revised according to the Commission's suggestions. The ground floor exterior wall was recessed to the rear face of the column, the second floor edge-beam turned down, and the

railing enclosing the second floor deck made heavier.

Mr. Bunshaft explained the numerous problems inherent in the design for this part of the building. Based on the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan's requirement to have an arcade ground floor, the original scheme could not successfully be done aesthetically for this site which sloped upwards to the north from the Avenue. He remarked that the Presidential Building at 12th Street and the Avenue had the columns of the first floor set back and the second level cantilevered out covering a portion of the walk. Both buildings are compromises of the arcade scheme for the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan solutions. In Mr. Bunshaft's opinion he commented that there was "no pure answer to the problem."

The members unanimously approved this revised design.

c. Pennsylvania Avenue Annex and Great Plaza Parking Facilities

The Commission was asked to approve a request for funds estimated for these two projects which provide for the completion of the Federal Triangle as planned in the 1920's and recommended in the report of the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Coast Guard and Old Post Office Buildings would be replaced and the Great Plaza developed as such with a parking garage underneath.

The Commission unanimously approved the request.

d. Selection of Sculptor for Courthouse and F.O.B., Philadelphia,Pa.

Brochures of Raymond Granville Barger, Joseph J. Greenberg, Jr., and Robert Ramiri were reviewed for selection of a sculptor to design outdoor sculpture for the east end of a pool between the Court Tower and the Office Building, adjoining Independence Mall.

The members felt these artists were inadequate for this project. They questioned the advisability of having any sculpture here and suggested that a massive fountain might be more appropriate.

The Secretary was authorized to discuss with representatives of Public Buildings Service the possibility of a fountain.

3. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Final Design Studies by Minoru Yamasaki, architect, and Sasaki, Dawson and DeMay Associates, landscape architects. Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the room.

A large model of the three-building complex and underground parking was presented, the design being essentially what was shown to the Commission at the initial submission. The landscape design, however, was considerably

improved. The width of the berm totally obscured the parking structures and planting and grading was greatly simplified. The members commented that the secondary entrance was too constricted and should repeat the plan for the main entrance. Also a restudy of the hangers for the horizontal sunshades had not solved the problem of a contrived appearance.

In discussing this feature, Mr. Bunshaft commented that the relationship of the structural elements, sunshade and hangers, was not solved and should be thoroughly restudied.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later in the session.

4. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery

The following projects were designed by Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects, and Sasaki, Dawson and DeMay Associates, landscape architects. Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the room during the discussion.

a. Administration Building - Proposed Design
b. Memorial Chapel - Proposed Design

A description of the projects was submitted by the architects. EXHIBIT A.

In discussing the above projects the members felt that the architectural concept was not clearly defined, there being a confusion between structural and decorative elements. Too many questions remained to be resolved before any action could be taken.

Further discussion on both projects was withheld until a conference with the architect later in the session.

c. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater-Proposed Alterations

Modifications proposed widening the plaza around the Tomb of the Unknowns and the amphitheater entrance. This plan would separate spectators from those participating in the ceremonies which could then be performed without interruptions from tourists. Existing communication facilities (television camera stands) would be replaced by flexible structures which could be removed to storage rooms provided under the extended terraced area. Repairs would be made to the Tomb and plans to prevent further deterioration were proposed.

Comparing drawings submitted and photographs of the original design of the Amphitheater the members felt the proposal represented a definite improvement, not only in the existing conditions, but also was much closer

in spirit to the original design.

The members approved the submitted plans.

5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas Place, N.E.-Revised Design

Withdrawn.

6. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

Medal Commemorating 100th Anniversary of the First Transcontinental Railroad (Golden Spike Society) - Proposed Design

Reviewing copies of the proposed design, the members considered it unacceptable. Mrs. Saarinen commented on attempts made to improve the designs of medals produced by the Bureau of the Mint. The situation appears hopeless.

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 68-19, 900 Maine Avenue, S.W. - Floating Restaurant

A perspective of a two-story floating barge with blue and white enameled panels was submitted. The site plan included entrance gate, service area, and crushed stone parking lot.

The members questioned many aspects of this project including the need for more than one floor, the design of the lighting fixtures, and the existing chain link fence. But they felt a more detailed study was unnecessary since this project is temporary. The Redevelopment Land Agency had approved the plan.

The Commission decided not to withhold approval of the project. The Commission's action was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(2) Watergate Development, Stage IV, Building 5 (Added)

Prior to the meeting, the Secretary and Mr. Myer met with Messrs. Fischer and Cecchi of the Watergate Development to discuss revising the design for Building 5 according to the Commission's previous recommendations. Drawings of the revised design indicated that the Commission's recommendation had been incorporated to the letter.

In the submitted scheme, the enclosure of roof structures which

formed a "second" penthouse had been eliminated, the setback or middle "hand" of the other buildings was repeated, the penthouse dimension of glass and the fascia matched Building No. 2. Balcony details were not mentioned during the conference with representatives of the Watergate Development since that feature had been previously approved by the Commission.

The members approved the revised design. They agreed that a repetition of the "spiked" design for the balconies on Building 1, to be constructed adjacent to the Kennedy Center, could not be approved. The staff was requested to advise the architect of this fact and to suggest that further study be given to the balcony design.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(3) Appendix 1

There was no objection to recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT B

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) ~~(4)~~ Appendix 2

There was no objection to recommendations by the staff on the Old Georgetown applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT C

IV. INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden - Revised Design

Mr. Frederick Gans of the New York office of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, and representatives of Public Buildings Service attended the meeting. Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room.

In reply to the members' questions expressed by Mr. Sasaki, Mr. Gans summarized as follows: Precast stone harmonizing in color with the travertine was planned for the plaza. A third row of trees might be added to the east of the Museum and every effort was being made to save existing trees. No funds were available for public parking facilities. It was contemplated that the staff would use the adjacent parking area assigned to the staff of the Smithsonian Institution. The sculpture garden would be shut-off at night and the twelve-foot retaining walls would serve as a security device at all times.

No definite answers could be given to questions concerning the weathering of travertine and the possibility of streaks from natural elements forming along the cornice line and from the balcony edge. No

study had been made of lighting for the coffered ceiling over the ground floor. The members were assured, however, that all of these remaining details would be thoroughly studied and presented to the Commission at a later date.

2. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Final Design Studies

Mr. Minoru Yamasaki, architect, Captain H.F. Curran, and other representatives of the Department of the Navy attended the meeting during the discussion. Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the room.

Speaking for the members, Mr. Bunshaft questioned the plan for the second entrance area commenting that the design for the main entrance was preferred. He recomended that the berm in the area near the second entrance extend beyond the building line. He expressed the members' opinion that the "parti was marvelous" but was weakened by the slender metal hangers for the horizontal sunshades. He suggested that the hangers should possibly be planned as real girders and also spaced further apart.

Mr. Yamasaki replied that the second entrance area could be treated similarly to the main entrance. His defense of his plan for slender metal hangers did not satisfy the Commission. He agreed, however, to restudy this portion of the design.

The transcript is included as EXHIBIT D.

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Mr. F. Donald Lethbridge, architect, and representatives of the Corps of Engineers, attended the meeting. Mr. Sasaki withdrew from the room.

Arlington National Cemetery

a. Administrative Building - Proposed Design

b. Memorial Chapel - Proposed Design

Mr. Lethbridge briefly discussed the purpose and design of the two structures including changes in the original program. The Chapel now included a columbarium on the lower level and the Administrative building would replace the existing one in the Custis Lee Mansion stable that would, in turn, be restored by the National Park Service.

Commenting for the Commission, Mrs. Saarinen stated that both designs" in different ways, were "overstatements and overly complicated structural

solutions." She requested that the design for the roof of the Chapel be explained.

Mr. Lethbridge explained that the ceiling of the Chapel had mechanical spaces from which the heating and cooling system was distributed. A plenum between the skylight and ceiling was necessary to control the extremes in temperature generated by the extensive skylights.

Defending his plan for the Administration Building, Mr. Lethbridge stated that the position of the central piers around the court created a screen effect and gave some privacy to the area. The columns were used both as supports and screen walls.

Mr. Bunshaft remarked that the structure was being used as an end in itself to fashion something out of nothing.

The Commission requested that both designs should be simplified and the structural system expressed more clearly and stronger.

The transcripts will be furnished to both the architect and the Department of the Army. EXHIBIT E

c. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater - Proposed Alterations

The Chairman stated that there were no objections to the proposed alterations.

4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas Place - Revised Design

Withdrawn

5. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

Discussion of Height of Building 1, Watergate Development

Roger L. Stevens and Ralph E. Becker of the Kennedy Center and Royce Ward and William Lichtenberg of Watergate Development, Barnes H. Ellis from the Attorney General's office, and Julian P. Green of the Department of Licenses and Inspections attended the meeting.

The transcripts of Mr. Steven's statement, the members' comments, and Mr. Ward's remarks are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT F A copy of Mr. Steven's statement and briefs by Lichtenberg and Luria, counsel for the Watergate Improvement Associates and by Mr. Becker, general counsel for the Kennedy Center have been made a part of the Commission's permanent file.

In a closed session, with Messrs. Ellis and Green attending, the members discussed their previous action. They voted 4 to 1 in favor of Mr. Bunshaft's statement that in a reply to Mr. Stevens' request the

Commission should say that the members were glad to listen to him and after hearing his comments they felt exactly the same as written in their last letter (21 September 1967, to the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustments.) The transcripts are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT G

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Submitted,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SITE AND ARCHITECTURAL MODIFICATIONS AT THE AMPHITHEATER AND TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the area surrounding it are suffering at present from several conditions which diminish its beauty and dignity. Cracks have appeared and widened on the retaining walls, paving, and Tomb itself. Prominent and inappropriate structures erected for the occasional use of newsmen compete for attention with the Tomb. Unprecedented crowds of visitors interfere with the functioning of the very ceremony they have come to see.

1. ACCOMMODATIONS FOR VISITORS

The Tomb area was not designed for the crowds that visit today. It is ringed with cars and buses from which visitors pour out in all directions. There is insufficient separation of traffic between the cemetery grounds and this place of special honor and respect. The dignity of the simple changing of the guard ceremony is frequently interrupted by the people who come to see it. There is place for relatively few to watch with unimpeded view, which causes considerable movement and confusion during the observance, with persons crowding perilously close to the edge of the wall and on occasion even impeding the guards' procession. Those who are fortunate enough to see, observe the monumental vista down the hillside and watch the proceeding against a background of milling, picture-taking tourists. A clear separation of functions is proposed to resolve many of these difficulties:

A. Private vehicles and tour buses are to be restricted to the central parking area near the entrance to the cemetery.

B. Pedestrians will be able to follow paths up the hill, parallel to the main steps

EXHIBIT A

but will be discouraged from entering the plaza at the site of the Tomb through the narrow passageways at the top of the monumental flight.

C. The Amphitheater complex is to be entered at well-defined gateways, i.e. from the west portico of the Amphitheater for minibus passengers, or from the new path system to the north and south of the Tomb plaza.

D. The public is to be restricted to viewing places somewhat removed from the guarded Tomb; places from which the panorama of the Tomb and the formal landscape beyond is undisturbed by the bustle of tourist arrivals and departures from the two small existing car lots, which will be removed.

E. The plaza area east of the new gates, the tombs and the monumental stairway, are to be reserved for ceremonial functions such as the guards' tour, the changing of the guards, wreath-laying ceremonies, and the procession of dignitaries up the stepped approach. It is felt that the Temple facade provides a backdrop for the Tomb, is the only structure visible as a symbol of the Tomb from the distant view, and therefore should be retained. This will be particularly important when the new Memorial Chapel is developed on the Tomb axis. However, several alterations to the building are suggested:

(1) It is proposed that the podium and the steps of the Temple be widened to provide a larger viewing area from an elevated height, and to provide direct circulation to the podium for visitors from the amphitheater side without forcing traffic through the narrow passageways leading through the building.

(2) Space under the extension of the podium can be used for new guard facilities and storage for press equipment and seating, freeing the catacombs under the colonnade for their originally intended use.

(3) The display of medals and other artifacts in the hall should be re-designed to form a more meaningful and attractive exhibit.

(4) The separation between public area and ceremonial area should be emphasized by a heavier stanchion and chain barrier.

2. PRESS ACCOMMODATIONS

The existing plywood and metal-tubing press stands are unsightly, dangerous, unnecessarily prominent and needlessly permanent in view of their infrequent use, and should be removed. A mobile TV and movie platform which can be rolled to an inconspicuous position among the trees specifically on days of its use, and returned immediately thereafter to a storage room provided under the extended temple podium.

3. STRUCTURAL DEFECTS

The cracks visible in the stone of the retaining walls, amphitheater, plaza and Tomb itself, are unsightly but do not represent serious danger of structural failure. Immediate and careful raking and sealing of the cracks at the surface after carrying out minor structural adjustments should prevent further deterioration in the body of the structures.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MEMORIAL CHAPEL AND COLUMBARIUM, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

The most important single new structure in the expansion of Arlington National Cemetery will be the proposed Memorial Chapel and Columbarium. Situated on the plain below the heights on which the Amphitheater and Tomb of the Unknowns now stand, it will link together the old and new grounds of the cemetery by the visual and symbolic extension of the formal axial development of those existing buildings, memorials and gardens.

At the edge of the oval lagoon, below the steps leading to the Chapel, will be a paved plaza, large enough to accommodate the assembled horse-drawn caisson, honor guard, military band and company of troops that make up a funeral procession with full military honors. Funeral services prior to interment may be held in the interfaith Memorial Chapel which will stand upon a low podium overlooking the plaza, lagoon and meadow. Beneath the podium an extensive Columbarium, or crypt for the burial of cremated remains, will be constructed. Preliminary plans for this building include the provision of approximately twenty-six thousand niches, each of which would ultimately contain one or more urns bearing the ashes of deceased military veterans and their next of kin. Adjoining the vaults will be a small room for meditation and prayer, and other public spaces to serve those who will visit this site of interment.

The basic conception of the Memorial Chapel is that of a place of worship in an enclosed "garden" court. Funeral services will be conducted in a space flooded at the edges with natural light from above, and surrounded by gardens of flowering

plants and trees. A sense of privacy and enclosure is created by the ascending levels of low walls which surround the central chapel space, the outer parapet level being four feet above the chapel floor. Bronze tinted tempered glass will form the actual physical enclosure of the room, extending from the granite floor to the concrete beams of the roof. The ceiling over the center of the Chapel will be of stained glass set in deep precast concrete coffers, to admit a much lower level of illumination than that over the planting areas at the sides of the room. Seating in the Chapel is not fixed and can be varied from 160 to 260, depending upon the occasion.

Entrance to the Chapel from under the lowest point of the structure, and from between the constricting walls of the rooms flanking the doors, will give a heightened sense of contrast as one passes into the more lofty, and more brightly lighted space beyond.

The dual nature of the building, (tomb as well as funeral chapel), and the scale of the building in the landscape, were principal influences in the development of the architectural form - a form which is intended to express permanence and serenity. Materials of construction will be architectural concrete, a white cement matrix with light granite or quartz aggregate, etched or bush-hammered. Floors will be granite or terrazzo. Non-structural members will be precast. Exterior walls of the Chapel are of glass. Skylighted ceilings are of double construction, with air distribution from the plenum as well as from the floor at the edge of the Chapel. If steam is not available on-site a gas fired boiler room will be provided, apart from the main building, underground, opening directly from the east retaining wall of the depressed service driveway behind the building. The service area will provide parking space for troop buses and chaplains' cars as well as an entrance for service and delivery vehicles.

The lower level of the building, in addition to the Columbarium, will contain temporary crypt, sacristy, chaplains' rooms, accommodations for the building staff and for the ceremonial troops who take part in the funerals, flower storage, mechanical spaces and public toilet areas. The total area of the lower level is 22,500 square feet. Total cost of the Building, including the construction of the lagoon is estimated at approximately $4,000.000.00.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

The purpose of this building is to provide administrative offices for Arlington National Cemetery, reception and waiting rooms for funeral parties and facilities for the cemetery security guards. It is located along the funeral procession road between the Memorial Gate and the Chapel.

The upper floor provides for an entrance vestibule with a central waiting area and two adjacent private waiting areas and toilets for the use of mourners awaiting the time of the funeral. In back and around the waiting area are arranged the administrative offices of the superintendent, his secretary and assistant, a conference room, a general office, the interment section and offices for a horticulturist and an engineer. Approximately 28 people will work here.

In the basement there are facilities for approximately 30 cemetery guards, as well as an employee lounge and kitchenette, records storage, mechanical equipment room and toilets.

Two entrances are provided. The front entrance is for public use while the back entrance will be used by the Administrative staff, funeral directors, cemetery guards, delivery and pickup, etc. Forty parking spaces are provided on two parking lots to either side of the building.

The building will be constructed of reinforced architectural concrete, of the same material as the Memorial Chapel, but with the finish more finely rendered because of the difference in scale between the two buildings. The area of the building is approximately 17,000 square feet and the cost, including grading and planting, is estimated at approximately $800,000.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 11/14/67

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
18	2700 Va. Ave., NW Watergate Development	Apt. bldg. Stage III, Bldg. 5.

ACTION: Disap'd. Details of recessed flrs., cornice, penthouse, & roof structures to match the design & dimensions of bldg. No. 2. Also question design of balustrades of balconies, 11/14/67.

19	900 Maine Ave., SW The Gangplank Restaurant	Floating restaurant off a bulkhead. The design is that of a houseboat.

ACTION: Because of tempo. (approx. 2 yrs.) nature of this facility, the Comm. waives its obj. to the design, 11/14/67.

20	1528-22nd St., NW Church of the Pilgrims	1 s-f, 20 sq-ft church name display, illuminated. (Former bulletin board has been removed.)

ACTION: Disap'd. Recom. sign of more modest & less commercial character. Recom. bronze free-standing ltrs. mounted on limestone or ltrs. incised directly in limestone, illuminated with small lights placed in front of the sign at grade level, 11/14/67.

22	2700 Va. Ave., NW Watergate Development	14-story reinforced concrete apt. bldg. Stage III, Bldg. 5.

ACTION: App'd. See attached Memo. dtd. 12/12/67 to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 12/12/67.

EXHIBIT B

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum · UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. Julian P. Green, Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building

DATE: 12/12/67

FROM : Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts

SUBJECT: S. L. 68-22

Attached to the regular submission of working drawings is a supplementary set of sections, roof plans, and elevations that contradict the original submission. These are modifications that the Commission of Fine Arts has insisted that the developers make in order that this building conform as closely as possible to building number two on the corner of New Hampshire and Virginia Avenues, N. W.

The design of the balcony "separating" panels and the balustrade was also carefully studied. The Commission would like to let the developers know that this detail should be considered not acceptable and the Commission's approval of S. L. 68-22 does not imply approval of any details of building number one, stage five.

Charles H. Atherton

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 11/14/67

NO OG 68-Inf.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
78	1352-28th St., NW Edward Burling, Jr.	Addn. & alteration to exist. residence.

ACTION: Design of new wing recom'd. No obj. to front door revisions of exist. structure, but restudy front bay fenestration & resubm. those details. Subm. brick & mortar samples, 11/14/67.

86	1300-30th St., NW Mrs. Mary Dean	New front stoop & steps.

ACTION: Recom'd., 11/13/67.

87	1733-34th St., NW Hintze	Upstairs--remove part'n. & close door. Remove broken brick-guard & replace with w. i.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest a more simple railing design, 11/14/67.

88	3404 P St., NW Suzan R. Mackler	Install door at garage arch for security while prev. app'd. alterations are being performed.

ACTION: Recom'd., 11/13/67.

89	1560 Wisc. Ave., NW John W. Lyon	Constr. auto parking attendant shelter.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Shelter proposed is completely unsuited to location. Restudy shelter & appropriate screen fences or walls in suitable character & materials, 11/14/67.

90	3342 M St., NW Helen F. Beatty	Remove exist. wood entr. & install alum. door & frame with sidelights.

ACTION: The Comm. regrets installation of door without review by Board, but waives any further action on this project, 11/14/67.

APPENDIX 2

EXHIBIT C

NO OG 68- Inf.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
91	1232-28th St., NW R.H. Cassedy & C.R. Leinbach	Add third story.

ACTION: Recom'd. for alternate #2 provided bay is eliminated on 3rd floor, 11/14/67.

92	3013 Dumbarton Ave., NW Mr. Robert Sivard	Replace deteriorating siding & window trim, cornice & entr. treatment on st. front; add dormer at rear part of bldg. & provide new rear entr.

ACTION: No obj., 11/14/67.

94	1500-27th St., NW The Spirits Shoppe	1 s-f, 10 sq-ft backlighted sign. Alum. ltrs., matte black finish.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Location of sign disrupts architectural character of bldg. Suggest a simple type of ltr. located over windows, 11/14/67.

95	1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW Tino Trakas (Restaurant)	Revise front elevation.

ACTION: Recom'd. Request subm. of awning material sample. Question draining awning on street, 11/14/67.

96	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Proposed apt. bldg. Also brick sample.

ACTION: Design recom'd., provided exterior lamps shown are eliminated. Brick not recom'd. Resubm. brick in the red range. Request review of working drawings prior to issuance of permit, 11/14/67.

98	2610 P St., NW Jerusalem Baptist Church	Cut masonry openings between Church & dwelling. Renovate complete house.

ACTION: No obj., 11/14/67.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

DEC 1 8 1967

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
97	1312-30th St., NW Mr. Chas. Coyer	Remove iron steps, substitute small balcony with grill work to match exist. window grill work.
ACTION: Because of matching relationship of design to adjoining structure, recom. retention of exist. steps & door, 12/5/67.		
99	1271 Wisc. Ave., NW David's Village Shop	1 s-f, 17 sq-ft sign.
ACTION: No obj., 11/29/67.		
100	3308 Reser. Rd., NW J. V. M. Mladek	Alterations to exterior front elevation, location of entr. doo moved in to window opening & window replaced by door.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided 6/6 light sash are used on front elevation, 12/5/67.		
101	3600 M St., NW D. C. Transit, Inc.	1 tempo. s-f sign in 3 sections. "Merry Christmas, Happy New Year, D. C. Transit." Similar to sign installed in prev. yrs.
ACTION: No obj. to 30-day installation, 11/22/67.		
102	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Georgetown Manor	1 s-f, 16½ sq-ft sign. Black ltrs. on white bckgd.
ACTION: Recom'd., 11/28/67.		
103	1694-31st St., NW Stephen Millett	Install fire escape on rear north side of bldg.
ACTION: Objection withdrawn if scrollwork is eliminated & fire escape is painted to match color of brick, 12/5/67.		

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
104	3413 R St., NW S. R. Cope	Replace exist. porch with new.
ACTION: Recom'd., 11/21/67.		
105	1073-31st St., NW Louis Levy	Replace wood panels in exist. doors w/glass. Install new hardware on doors. Paint exterior brick on street facade.
ACTION: Recom'd., 12/5/67.		
106	3323 P St., NW Eustis Emmet	Constr. 1-story, 2-car garage.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided garage is brick or stucco, & painted to match house, 11/28/67.		
107	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Brick sample & proposed apt. bldg.
ACTION: Design of bldg. recom'd. except for roof structures & other mechanical equipm. that may be visible. Request subm. of detailed drawings showing this inf. Brick not recom'd. Resubm. more suitable brick sample, for panel erection on site showing joint type & color, 12/5/67.		
108	1656-32nd St., NW Barbara A. Rathe	Revise bay window & doorway as recom'd. following original subm.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided proportions of glass lights on front & sides of bay are the same, & bay corner posts are boxed. No further subm. requested, 12/5/67.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

NOV 9 1967

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
77	1305 Potomac Ave., NW Jos. E. Keller (Apts.)	Install larger windows on Alley side.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided sash is divided into 2 with a brick pier. Resubm. revised drawings, 10/25/67.

79	3248 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	Replace app'd. cast iron stairs with limestone. Constr. brick wall 3'-8" wide by 10" high between exist. walls.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided there be 2 balusters per tread & that the balusters be 5/8" square in section & that nosings on tread be 2" in diameter, 10/25/67.

80	3212 N St., NW Mrs. M. Liverman	Resubm. of enlarged showwindow.

ACTION: Recom'd., 10/25/67.

81	3241 Prospect St., NW Sealtest Foods	Install structural steel canopy on west side of exist. bdg.

ACTION: No obj., 10/24/67.

82	1311-35th St., NW L. T. Morgan	Install 5" alum. siding on all frame outside wall areas, except front wall. Cover window & door trim, eave boards & window sills. Omit tin walls in rear house.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that new siding match exist. siding, also that the exist. wood trim corner boards & window-door trim be built up to match exist. projections, 10/25/67.

83	2610 P St., NW Jerusalem Baptist Ch.	Cut masonry openings between Church & dwelling. Renovate complete house.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Incorporate appropriate lintel over showwindow. Reproportion lights in window so that they are taller than wide. Lower light fixture & subm. detailed description of type. Also subm. details of doors, 10/25/67.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) NOV 9 1967

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
84	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Apt. bldg.

ACTION: Design is recom'd., but request subm. of complete set of drawings showing all elevations & roof plans prior to issuance of permit. Subm. specific data on outdoor lights. Restudy ironwork omitting scrollwork & substituting 5/8" square vertical members for twisted members. Also subm. brick sample, 10/25/67.

85	3288 M St., NW Vesuvio Restaurant	1 canvas awning with fixed iron frames over doorway.

ACTION: Ret'd. for neat, accurate drawing showing relation of awning to windows as well as lights, door & cornice, 10/31/67.

93	1305 Potomac Ave., NW Jos. E. Keller	Insert 2 larger windows in basem. apt.

ACTION: Recom'd., 11/1/67.

MR. GANS: This is about 8-1/2 or 9 feet here and frankly we have not studied it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we'll want to know.

MR. GANS: Yes, indeed.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If the Commission has nothing further to say, we'll go on to the next item.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think this is beautiful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In the interests of our schedule we'll move on.

(Defense Office Building - Anacostia/Bolling)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Briefly, you know, we think great improvements have been made in the exterior thing, particularly the center courts and we've asked Mr. Bunshaft to give a brief discussion.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We think we understand it. There are only two things. We are a little concerned about this circle, that space. We almost wish there wasn't a hole in that area (indicating on model).

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes, it's a little forced.

MRS. SAARINEN: On this side you have related it beautifully to the building. Could you re-work that one?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes, maybe we'll just ventilate it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Don't you think it would be nice to feel the land come out from there somehow? That's easy.

The next is not so easy.

EXHBIT D

EXHIBIT D

You have a structural building here. I think you're planning a clear span.

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes, that's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And it's nice but we are concerned about this (indicating on drawings). That overhangs and gets to be Eric Mendelsohn business, you know -- a lot of horizontals and we think this is kind of artificial. It isn't doing anything. We are not against the overhangs, but against these little rows --

MRS. SAARINEN: The little wires.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm trying to say the overhangs aren't doing anything. What are they doing? You're not carrying all that up here. You could cantilever these out easily, but they wouldn't look good; that's what I mean by Eric Mendelsohn -- if you didn't have these things out here --

MR. YAMASAKI: What happens structurally is by having this we can keep these things from (inaudible). I think the structural engineering will prove that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We're just bulling here. In the first place, the parti is marvellous but we think it would be a stronger thing -- it's kind of decorative -- it would cost a little dough, if the structure went out to the edge. It might not cost more dough. The span would increase and you really have a strong building showing the structure. That is not maybe what you want to do. Then you might save enough

Then you might save enough money by this wall going along without hitting columns which could maybe help to pay for the bigger span.

We think it is kind of weak. This is getting down to whether you like steak or potatoes or duck and stuff.

MR. YAMASAKI: One problem if you take this and span that (indicating on drawing) you got part of your structure in heat and cold and part in constant temperature.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes, I know. We have been involved in things like that. We've done that, done it in Texas, where they have a worse climate, Houston, Texas. I'm sorry. That's a steel building. Excuse me. But there is something wrong here. I don't know whether I am speaking right but I don't think any of us would like to buy this thin thing. It does hold the thing together and gets away from this sort of Eric Mendelsohn horizontals and gets some vertical, but we question whether that's a meaningful vertical.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well on this section a little piece of it hangs down at the end, which is sort of --

MR. YAMASAKI: That is actually the sunshade.

MRS. SAARINEN: Oh, I see.

MR. YAMASAKI: And it's really supporting, as you can see.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What I am saying is when you look at this (indicating model) and see the size of those

horizontal bands, it really looks like structure -- I just woke up to it -- and it isn't.

MR. YAMASAKI: It's a hanger.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In fact, you need that mass for this great length; otherwise that horizontal would be a piece of paper.

MR. YAMASAKI: It does two things: one, that it keeps the cantilever slab separate in a sense, temperature-wise,from the structural; and the other is if we are going to cantilever which we doing here, then it keeps the long cantilever from deflecting.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But it's sort of faked up. On the model right here it looks as though it has that much solid, but in perspective is going to look very thin. The whole thing is sort of funny, because in a building of this great length, I think myself the structure ought to really get out there.

MR. YAMASAKI: If this were glass and that were glass (indicating on drawings) we could do the job, except we can't do it that expensively and all you need is to cut the sun ought, is all you need. You don't need a great big structure out here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You also need a good design. I think it looks good but what we are trying to say is we'd like to have it kind of look like it was doing something. The more you think about it, there's really a thin little paper and

this ell thing gives it the sort of sense it's a big structure. I think there's a conflict here.

MR. YAMASAKI: If I may say so, I think we were very deliberate in the attempt to make the buildings look right because these are immense buildings, 700 feet long, and here are really immense buildings and if we had a heavy structure on the exterior, I think the buildings would look heavy.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have a heavy structure. That horizontal band is not light; it has some guts to it.

MR. YAMASAKI: Whatever we've done in the past is kind of vertical. Here is a chance tohave a very horizontal building and it's a natural because of the immensity of the building and the lowness, so we wanted to express the horizontality and unfortunately these wires are too thin. We couldn't get a wire that would hold straight. That over there (pointing to model) is correct; it's a hanger. You know you can hold an awful lot on a little steel cable.

MRS. SAARINEN: It's like a little piece of jewelry, you know, put on out of scale. We like so much of it that we just -- you know, we questioned this the first time, too, this detail. I don't know enough about structure, but it would seem to me that if maybe it were not so deep and were a real cantilever that didn't have to be held up somehow -- there is really the structural column behind it, and you get

the break -- I don't know.

MR. YAMASAKI: Well, I tell you, if the Commission said we had to put the columns on the outside, then I think we would eliminate the overhangs, you know. I feel that strongly about it, because of the fact that I think we should span from here to here (indicating) and not from here to there (indicating) and you cause yourself all kinds of problems while doing it, and not only that, but increase the cost substantially.

So I think then we take the overhangs off and then I think it would be a terribly dull building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a concrete building?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Excuse me for being dumb. What would happen if you made this thing really hang this thing (indicating), have these things real girders and have the verticals every 60 or 90 feet so these really are girders doing something and get some guts up here, so you are hanging the thing and it looks like you're hanging it, and these look like really girders, not just sort of six-inches thick?

I'm just throwing out something. It's not my bowl of fruit, but our group has the feeling we like everything but have a feeling this is kind of thin and won't count. I don't know.

MR. YAMASAKI: One problem, and we've been through

the Queen -- I don't know.

that, when you get a 90-foot span, you get like that (inaudible). This is 18 feet apart.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You mean these are 18 feet on center? The hangers?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is this pre-cast concrete?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes. Here's a sample.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This horizontal is made out of that, too?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes, pre-cast and as thin as possible with ribs.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I think we've talked all that we can.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, I think we have.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That garage is wonderful, the way you worked up the embankment. Are they going to build it -- the garage? Well, they're going to build it as much as they're going to build this?

MR. YAMASAKI: Yes, that's right.

Did the Commission look at these drawings?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Isn't that the hole I'm talking about?

MR. YAMASAKI: This is the entrance. The hole you're talking about is next door. Here's the front door and inside, as you go from building to building, or from garage

to building or from bus entrance to building, you go through this (indicating on drawings).

MRS. SAARINEN: I see.

MR. YAMASAKI: Then we have this garden which is very special in the middle.

MRS. SAARINEN: Beautiful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's a lovely solution. Informal but very sharp.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have the start of something but this could be quite juicy here (indicating on model). There is something kind of papery about this detail of concrete and steel mullions.

MRS. SAARINEN: Maybe if they really hung from floor to floor more -- in a strange way -- you know, so if one does hang and supports the next one, if you had some sense of that.

MR. YAMASAKI: Did you look at the detail of it?

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you followed it through, these should not be concrete. If you are really hanging this thing and this is metal (indicating on drawing) -- I think having this in concrete because it really ought to be concrete, there's something funny happening there. I don't know. You know what I'm saying, the concrete is kind of a -- well --

MR. YAMASAKI: They could be; they don't need to be.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, just visually.

MR. YAMASAKI: They could be.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I think we've gone over it as much as we can. I think the Commission wants to think a little more about it. I think we have all said everything we are willing to. We like enormously what's going on around here. It's miles better and we will discuss it.

Thank you very much.

(Arlington Cemetery)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'll go into Executive Session for the first presentation of this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We ought to talk a minute here. I think these architects come here to find out -- one of our things is to get a clear thing of what we feel, and I don't think we can just mumble.

MRS. SAARINEN: Should I have a dry run with all of you? We are going to disapprove it, aren't we?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are in agreement we don't like it.

MRS. SAARINEN: I would like a dry run why we don't approve it, and I'd like to be corrected.

We feel that both of them in different ways are overstatements and complicated, are overly complicated structural solutions. Is that the right thing?

EXHIBIT E

SAMPLE

(At this point, the architect and his party entered the Conference Room.)

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Would you like me to go over the general location and plan at all again?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, we've done it already again this morning, and have done it before.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: The three projects to be considered, as you know, are the chapel, columbarium, the administration building in this location (indicating on drawing) and certain alterations in the area of the amphitheater and Tomb of the Unknowns. Taking them in this order, the preliminary design that you see today is the result of further development from those earlier sketches that you saw. There has been a substantial change in program which has altered the form of the building, and that was the condition that the lower level of the building be developed as a columbarium or crypt for the interment of cremated remains. This building will contain about 26,000 crypt spaces for that purpose.

There has been a gradual change over the years, an increase in the percentage of the number of cremates that seek interment in the cemetery, and this will in effect increase the amount of available space in the cemetery over a period of years.

As you may recall, the area between the Tomb of the Unknowns and the amphitheater and lagoon on which the chapel

faces is going to be an area reserved as an open meadow, free of headstones, and will be held open for the burial of persons in special categories of eligibility for the far future. This is one way that Arlington can be kept active, so to speak, into the far distant future.

The building is conceived as thought of as a reinforced architectural concrete structure. The general concept of the design is that of the chapel having a ceremonial garden court, so to speak. The edges of the space within are skylighted above, these areas (indicating on drawing) will be illuminated, and these (indicating) are naturally skylighted areas that surround the seating area. The coffered ceiling over the seating area will be an area of less intense illumination, probably by the use of stained glass within the coffers. Seating is not fixed. It can be a range of from 160 to about 260 seats, which is the program that has been developed.

Structurally the building consists of four hollow columns which house the vertical elements of design, elevators and stairways, and deep coffered roof construction, which, as I said before, permits light to descend to the central or chapel area.

Below the chapel this podium is developed as crypt space; the columbarium; a small meditation chapel or meditation room; mechanical areas, other service areas including

chaplain's room, small sacristy, storage for flowers, crypt for bodies, chair storage, troop room and guard receiving room.

Now in connection with this, it is probably important to point out that the parking, the recessed or depressed -- this section (indicating) probably shows this best -- area for service to the rear of the building will provide parking not only for service vehicles; that is, flower delivery and other service vehicles, but also parking for the troop buses and at a full honors funeral, they'll be able to unload the troops at this area (indicating), and have them ascend to the ceremonial plaza which lies between the chapel and the lagoon.

We have recommended that the building be constructed as I said before of architectural concrete, a rendered surface, color and materials to be compatible with those other buildings, with those used in other buildings in the cemetery.

At the Planning Commission meeting last week it was recommended that the building be of marble to match the other buildings. Personally I don't agree with this, but it is something that might be done, but it simply is not that kind of building. It would be neater in marble, but it is particularly this sort of space frame which will be finished essentially the same inside and outside which we feel is more suitable building in architectural concrete with a coarse or

chaplain's room, small cassette, storage for flowers, urns
for bodies, white envelope, ivory rose and spare restroom
room.

Now in conversation with Dale, I am pressing myself not
to point out that the wedding, the weekend in Bodyguard -- it's
action (location) probably shows Alia best -- more it
serves to not even it the celebrity will pay for anyone
only for service vehicles, cars in, flower fellows and other
service vehicles, not only personal to the room rooms and
at a full banana flowers, they'll be able to enjoy the flower
to this area (location), and don't like people to the
ceremonial place which surrounds the angel and the figure.

We have recommended that the building or ceremony
as I said basis of exploitation covering a improved
surface, color and ownership it be compatible with other
buildings, into those data it would initiate by the ceremony.

At the planning commission meeting last week it
was recommended that the building be of service I mean the
flower buildings. Personally I don't agree with this not
it is something that might be done, but it should be per-
fect or nothing. It would be better to wait, and if
permanently this air of space room rules will be removed
eventually the same design was initial below we that is
more suitable building in architectural concept with a color

nearly white aggregate that would be exposed or bush hammered.

Perhaps it would be better to try to answer your questions than go from one to the other?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, let's go to the next one. The other thing is a different problem.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Yes, the Administration Building provides space for not only administrative offices of the cemetery -- I might point out that this building is planned and constructed because the existing Administration Building behind the Custis Lee Mansion will be taken over by the Park Service as part of the Custis Lee complex. It will be restored.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: So this will be for the whole cemetery?

MR. LETHBRIDGE: This will be for the entire cemetery, that's correct. This building has some other uses, however; it will act as a receiving space and waiting space for funeral parties which sometimes assemble at the cemetery. At times, the cemetery procession moves in, already formed, into the cemetery from Washington; at other times, the procession assembles in the cemetery. They would then proceed to the chapel and from that point to wherever it is determined. This lobby space on this side of the building, these private rooms are reserved for that purpose.

Occasionally, very occasionally the building must take care of large numbers of people. This is not typical but the number of people waiting or assembling before a funeral may vary from a dozen or so to as many as 150 to 200 people which is one reason why this central atrium or court will be useful as well as decorative within the building.

The lower level has another separate function in that it will serve as the headquarters for the cemetery guards, and particularly now with plans under way to have the cemetery open during the evening, during the night, this guard contingent will be increased in number.

We recommended that this building be constructed of essentially the same materials as the chapel but because of the difference in scale that the material be more finely rendered. We have developed this design somewhat differently from the earlier sketches that you saw, in an effort to fit it iinto the cemetery without its being overly monumental and in that fashion detract from the chapel and grounds.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have asked Mrs. Saarinen to lead off for us with questions and so forth. I think this is a good presentation that clears up some of the things we couldn't answer as we studied this.

MRS. SAARINEN: First of all we want to pay a compliment to Arlington for having hired a good architect and

giving him a chance to do the buildings that have some connection with each other. But we do have some very fundamental questions. For instance, if you put up the section of this building, of the chapel, we have looked at your model both upside down and -- we took it apart but we're very confused about all this extra sort of Frank Lloyd Wright type structure which does not seem to be really structure and we're very curious about what goes on in these spaces.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Well, I can explain that. I think there is one member here (indicating drawing) which would seem to be redundant. That is this central member. These are the main beams (indicating).

MRS. SAARINEN: Exactly. That we understood. Those are the ones we understand.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: And these beams form part of a continuous grid that extends from this point over the main beams and they criss-cross over the roof. We could not build the model in our own shop to illustrate this precisely. In other words, these (indicating on drawing) carry through as a grid out to this point. Now, there are two advantages to these other deep members: one, we feel that an additional louvering of the strong vertical light around the perimeter is desirable; and secondly, from a structural engineering standpoint, this third member acts to load the center of the span more heavily in order to prevent a reverse

movement at the center of that beam because of the overhang on either side.

The space at the edges will be occupied, at least in part, by the air handling units, chilled water and hot water will be carried to these points, and the heating and cooling of the building will be taken care of in two ways: one, there will be vertical distribution at the edge of the chapel and there will be air distributed through the ceiling from these mechanical spaces in the roof of the structure.

MRS. SAARINEN: I am somewhat skeptical having been around architects so long. Are you sure you didn't find a reason to think or this hot and cold thing because you really wanted to have this extra space?

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Well, no, as a matter of fact, it's truthfully difficult to trace back precisely how that occurred, but we know that we must develop a plenum between the skylight and ceiling or we'd be unable to control the streams of heat and cold in a building that has essentially an all-glass roof in the central part. This will allow us to do that.

MRS. SAARINEN: All right, let me proceed to a couple of other questions.

Has anyone else any other questions before we go on?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Go ahead. Anyone can interject.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think your parti scheme of four piers and structural big roof, I think myself -- most of us -- what started this, this sort of motif here on this wall looks like something that is going around. You wonder what all this is (indicating in drawing), so I think if I were to say what my opinion is, the idea of four piers holding up a great big structural excitement is fine, but I don't think it's clear enough. I don't think it's strong enough. I think actually it is fussy.

You know, each cook has his own way of cooking soup, and I think this is very complicated and sort of using structure partially honestly and partially sort of decorative, and I don't think you are getting themost out of your scheme which I think myself could be very exciting, four piers and a tremendous structure over it. It seems to me too complicated, and then the idea of trees around it, if they will grow, it's a very exciting idea and might even be carried further.

Another detail that bothers me, the main entrance. You have these four piers and sort of offices in front, and they start looking like structure. Those are some of the unpleasant things of a program, I suppose, and that waters it down to -- I think the whole group here feels the roof and its slope in the elevations, because those seem sort of arbitrary, there isn't the clarity or strength of a great

roof structure, and I am not sure if you're not getting too much glass -- above, below, sideways, and all that. It depends, of course, on how dark or how stained glass they are.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is that the true depth of the beams that protrude out this way?

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: When we were reading it first, we read it wrong.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It looks like a second floor. In fact, the first thing we did was look for rooms and we wondered what they are. That's why Aline was asking what are those little things up there.

I don't think you're getting the most out of your scheme, which is a nice idea: four piers, a tremendous structure. Maybe it could be made stronger by being simpler. We are just, you know, suggesting this.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: This hollowing out of the space we feel is important. From the lowest main beam which stands out here -- incidentally, there's some structural significance, some advantage in extending the end out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh, we don't mind that. That only illustrated why we were curious what is all this up here.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Well, the full depth of the roof construction is used, we might say, within the space by

stepping up the structural members and in effect hollowing out the interior area. I think that the compression and closeness that one experiences at the entrance, as you come under the lowest beams and then with the space being lifted much higher within, is an important part of the entrance to the building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes, but I think you could, if you wanted to, with four piers, have a pair of girders going in both directions which would be these main girders here (indicating on model). Then this space here you could do anything you wanted to -- make it that high, if you want to. The thing that spans is these main girders, and from there on you have secondary things. I think there's a mixing of the real gutsy girders and these other things.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The word we used constantly was "simplification."

MR. LETHBRIDGE: As I said before, these members (indicating on model) and with the present system framing this member and this member, in other words these inner members are essential. What the model does not show is the carrying through.

MRS. SAARINEN: No, but you show it down there.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: This central member is an added member in that it was felt it had two advantages: one, it created the stepping up of the structure from this lowest

point to the higher interior space; and secondly, it tended to louver the light; in other words, the stronger natural light will be washed down the sides of these deep structural members. We thought a lot before we put that extra member in there, and it was principally for those purposes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I guess what we are suggesting is that you think even further and maybe they should come out. That is sort of the direction of our thinking.

MRS. SAARINEN: Really you know it is a little bit like writing an article or something, and it really needed editing down to strength, even what is there. This really does detract.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Incidentally, we went into Executive Session and kicked the press out so we could just have a frank discussion of what we feel about it. We are much more inhibited when the press is here, and it's the first presentation of this exact thing, and we hope that what we are saying will be treated as working suggestions.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Well, I think we can see if -- take the basic parti -- the other parts perhaps I didn't explain very well, which perhaps are not under question, the stepping up of the floor levels in the chapel area tend to enclose the space from within, despite the fact that we surround the chapel with glass walls. You can see that this,

in other words, is higher again so when you're within the chapel, there is a privacy, sense of privacy despite the open character of the construction.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Does any other member want to comment on the chapel before we move on?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you have a nice idea. I really think, if I may be very blunt, it looks like you've been doing the structure in your own interpretation. I really think you put in all this concrete that really is not needed. I think it could be a stronger design if it were pure and structural expression, and that brings you right to the next building where concrete has been used. You know you have 10-foot walls to hold up a little roof. I think you are using this concrete a little too much for design, shall we say.

I think the parti and four piers and the tremendous roof and the trees around the glass enclosure with glass above is wonderful, but to me it's not as strong as it could be. Usually great things are very simple. I think with all the action you have going around, trees and piers and stuff, perhaps the center part ought to be much higher instead of just a little. Anyhow, that's you know, superficial.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We want to move to this building, too, while we are about it, and you started on it, Mrs. Saarinen. Do you want to continue?

MRS. SAARINEN: Let Gordon do it and get it over with.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The sentences were snatched from your mouth.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think basically one could almost use the same feeling.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You ought to put the plan up.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes, let's put the plan up.

Really in a way this again is a kind of over-statement. It seems an awful lot of to-do about a rather simple building, and rather simple parti and plan. If our reading of your scale is right, for instance, your center posts there are about 10 feet. It seems like an enormous amount of over-expression in a way. I mean all of these fins.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: I don't really feel that way about it myself, obviously. I think we are keeping this area (indicating on drawing) free of any structural members, of course, but this diagonal --

MR. BUNSHAFT: You're only spanning about 30 feet. These are only 30-foot spans; if these were 100-foot spans, it would mean something, but these are only 30 feet. You could put a post or something there. I don't propose to do it, but my own feeling on this scheme is there is a problem of getting some special quality other than just a little one-story building. Why not span this with four corner elements

and span the whole thing? And get some real gutsy sort of whatever you like in the corner and certainly that corridor is ruined by those piers. I don't think you need those piers. If you want to do something, a 90-foot roof isn't anything.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: I think that's kind of a subjective point, though. I think the court, the way the piers are placed here, has a real strength in this particular design, in that it creates a certain amount of screening and privacy from the lobby area, and the other areas.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But it is artificial. If that is a support, it's like somebody with elephantiasis. Again you're using structure sort of to create a mood. Maybe it ought to be done some other way. I think that's all we're trying to say.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Well, I can't --

MR. BUNSHAFT: You can't. You've worked on it?

MR. LETHBRIDGE: This is something I can follow pretty well, but I think --

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is pure decoration. Those are not supports at all. It's pure decoration and if that's it, all right, but they look like supports and God knows no engineer would know what to do with them. You are holding up a 30 by 30 foot bay. It doesn't mean you should put little posts, but again I say I think structure is being used to create something -- there is something wrong.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: I think that here you seem to be upset --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Not me. All of us. I just holler a lot, but everybody here has discussed this. I think I'm right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is true, and I want the record to show Mr. Sasaki withdrew merely because he is so involved in the landscape thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's not me. I'm just talking for the group. Everybody thought there was something a little wrong.

MRS. SAARINEN: He said the court was for an overflow of people.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: An assembly area must be covered.

MR.LETHBRIDGE: These are columns, supports, and also quite deliberately walls; and it could surely be argued they are over-designed as pure structural supports, but I don't think that's the point. They are conceived as a combination of both and we feel that they are useful as walls, as well as supports.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we wanted you to understand what our reservations were, and we thought this was the best form of making it clear what our reservations were.

We have none, incidentally, on the third thing,

revision around the Tomb of the Unknown. I'll just put that in the record, too. We have no objections to the plans there.

I think that really states our position. It is really a matter of getting your traffic better and certain use and it is probably going to look better.

Well, I feel we have outlined our position on these two, and what is the basis of our reservations about them.

MRS. SAARINEN: One thing I must say, that I think he's going to have these strong beams coming out, it would look pretty silly to go putting marble all around the edges.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think if you get closer to the real structure of the roof -- with the big main wall, it doesn't look like a structure, looks like a wall on the second floor, but when you get it down to a real structure, I think you have four piers, it certainly ought to be four, and I think concrete with stained glass.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: The central portion.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It would be wonderful.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: You want a difference in intensity of light.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Very good. Well, we thank you very much.

MR. LETHBRIDGE: Will there be a transcript of this? It would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely, both a letter and transcript.

Thank you, gentlemen.

(Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m. the meeting was adjourned, to be reconvened at 2:30 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION (2:38 p.m.)

(John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Stevens, come and join us.

MR. STEVENS: Am I the only performer?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You're the only performer today. You have the center stage.

MR. STEVENS: This is a terrible way to reat a former theater producer who is used to bringing the whip out and bringing people on.

I'm going to have to trust to God and a fast outfield here; I have about half my statement, which I'm sure will be here, following me down the street.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we're more interested in words than in troops.

MR. STEVENS: The troops have the rest of my speech, but I'll go ahead anyway.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Improvise.

MR. STEVENS: I'll improvise if I have to. Otherwise, you'll think words are being put in my mouth.

Well, anyway, as you all know, I'm Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center and I'm grateful for a chance to appear here before the Fine Arts Commission. Unfortunately, I had a long-scheduled trip with Mr. Johnson at the time of the last meeting, and I couldn't make it. But I would like to ask for reconsideration of the action of

EXHIBIT F

EXHIBIT F

September 20th with reference to the proposed Building No. 1 of the Watergate Development.

As an individual who has made a living in speculation in real estate before I became a government official, I would like to state that I am very sympathetic to the Watergate group. I have known some of the principals of this project, have found them honest and intelligent, and feel they have done a fine job in the development of their project.

As an ex-speculator who has had more than passing success in this field, to which I think both Mr. Salgo and Mr. Ward can attest, I find very touching the concern shown by the newspapers and others. As the individual who first promoted the Southwest Washington redevelopment, with the many troubles facing me, I do not remember having such help. I was forced, because of lack of funds caused by government agencies undervaluating of the property--which time has shown to be wrong--to get out of a potentially profitable undertaking. These are the kinds of risks that speculators face and if they don't like it, they should choose another business.

I think that a speculator is entitled to be well paid for the risk he takes, but I am completely baffled why in the matter before us today the Watergate group should have the privilege of being protected from an obvious known risk by governmental bodies. The National Cultural Center location was created by an Act of Congress in 1958 and was a known

potential risk to any developer. This risk was known to the developer in 1962 when it received a conditional order from the Zoning Commission to protect the Center. There was a further risk in 1964 when Congress voted unanimously to designate the Center as the sole official memorial to President Kennedy in the Capital of the United States and appropriated very substantial funds to make it so.

Watergate has had full knowledge of this when they started construction of stage No. 1. In 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, the Center's General Counsel appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals and urged that the open question of the height of the proposed Building No. 1 in the Zoning Commission order be resolved.

The first time that Watergate filed the application for a building permit to construct Building No. 1 was last June, and it only came before the various agencies for the first time for their view -- or our views -- whichever you want to call it, in September and October. That was the first legal opportunity for the Center to present its views and objections.

When I appeared before the National Capital Planning Commission, I posed several points for their consideration in light of changed conditions. This included the questions as to whether Building No. 1 should be built at all or whether there should be a scaled down building, or other alternatives.

(At this point, Mr. Stevens removed Building No. 1 from the model displayed on the Conference Room table.)

MR. STEVENS: Now, I ask you, looking at the model of both the Watergate complex and the Center with and without Building No. 1, to state which park-setting would be aesthetically preferred?

Why should there be any difference in the park-like setting for a memorial to President Kennedy than Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson or Theodore Roosevelt?

Is it now aesthetically appropriate? This seems to me the essence of the question, rather than any past acts or conversations. There is no reason why the Watergate should be hurt financially by an Act of Congress but I asked the National Capital Planning Commission and this Commission that sufficient study be made of this problem so that any economic loss be minimized in order that we have an appropriate Presidential memorial for posterity.

It is my opinion and considered judgment that once Congress designated this building as a memorial to President Kennedy, all past actions should be completely reviewed. The question is whether one more apartment house dominating this Presidential memorial is in good order, good taste, and with due regard for the public interest involved? I think that the public values inherent in this memorial should be

protected by you.

I am appearing here today as a public official charged with a public trust. None of the Trustees of the Kennedy Center are concerned with any materialistic gain. Their only concern is to carry out a specific mandate from Congress to make this a living memorial to a martyred President.

Here is a memorial built for generations to come. Can you, in good conscience, as custodian of aesthetics, say that Building No. 1 should be constructed as proposed?

We seek your guidance, counsel, and advice to prevent avoidable impairment of a Presidential memorial so that this matter be amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

I would appreciate your reconsideration of this matter until such time as the National Capital Planning Commission makes its study and recommendation of the various alternatives that may well solve this problem.

The Trustees of the Center do not want to become involved in legal action unless compelled to do so. Your reconsideration of your past action would be most influential in preventing legal action and preventing an inappropriate setting for this Presidential memorial.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much. Don't leave us. I want to ask the various members of the Commission if they have any questions to ask while we've got you here.

MR. STEVENS: Fine.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki, do you have any questions?

MR. SASAKI: No, I think the statement was very clear, very forceful, very well stated.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith?

MRS. SMITH: I agree. It was a very good statement.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Walker?

Mrs. Saarinen?

MRS. SAARINEN: Excellent. I agree, also.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft, have you any comments?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No.

MRS. SAARINEN: I assume we'll have a copy of this? It has been taken down.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am sure there will be ample copies.

MR. STEVENS: Yes, there are plenty of copies.

MRS. SAARINEN: And they'll come with our minutes?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

Mr. Stevens, you can be certain that we will study your statement and consider it deeply, as we have this project over

CHAIRMAN WELDON: [illegible]

it. I want to ask the [illegible]

it very much for [illegible]

MR. BERMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WELDON: [illegible]

questions?

MR. [illegible]: Mr. I [illegible]

close, very [illegible], very well [illegible].

CHAIRMAN WELDON: Mrs. [illegible]

MRS. CHAIN: I [illegible]. I [illegible]

CHAIRMAN WELDON: Mr. [illegible]

MRS. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

CHAIRMAN WELDON: Mr. [illegible]

comments?

MR. [illegible]: [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: [illegible]

It [illegible] [illegible].

CHAIRMAN WELDON: I've [illegible]

[illegible].

MR. [illegible]: They [illegible]

MRS. [illegible]: [illegible]

CHAIRMAN WELDON: Mrs.

MR. [illegible]: I [illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]

a long period of years. We will not be hasty in our decision. We will give it our full intellectual study.

We thank you very much for coming.

MR. STEVENS: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I say, I do appreciate the chance to make our -- or at least attempt to make our point of view known; and as I say, I just want to repeat once more that I understand the problems of the Watergate group; I've been through it, and I know whatever is done will be the best, and I can assure you whatever the decision is, we'll try to do our best to work with the Watergate in any possible way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am sure you will.

Thank you very much.

MR. WARD: May I just say one word? I just want to clarify one point of Mr. Stevens' statement.

We did have approval of Building No. 1 in 1962, subject to a possible modification. Now, a possible modification, of course, does not mean elimination of the building which they're now discussing. The question of elimination of the building, I believe, is before Congress at the moment. There has been a bill introduced, I believe Mr. Stevens is aware of, for condemnation of the site. Of course, if the land is condemned and Congress sees fit to appropriate the funds that are necessary, then it becomes a court matter to decide the value.

I would like to say, however, that as you take the building and I hate to be telling you folks here about the aesthetics, but I am sure you are aware of this, as you take the building up you do see the green park-like area adjacent to it, but the only place this would be visual would be from one of the planes flying by or from Theodore Roosevelt Bridge directly across the Potomac River and in no approach to the Cultural Center can you see this. We've had photographs taken to point this out. We did not bring them because we didn't think it necessary to make another presentation here. The only place you could possibly be aware of the park-like setting is standing right in the center of it or if you're on one of the shuttles coming down from New York.

Mr. Stevens talks of the other memorials. All the ones he refers to are monuments and setting up the Kennedy Center, it was designated as a living memorial which we think makes it a little different from the Jefferson Memorial, Washington Monument, and the Memorial to Theodore Roosevelt where in truth you need a park-like setting.

We think there's a great deal of merit in having life around the Kennedy Center, so that it shall truly be a living memorial as the Congress intended.

Thank you, Mr. Walton.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, may I just say one more thing?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, as long as this debate doesn't go on long; you can debate among yourselves after you have presented your cases.

Good. If you have something germane to this presentation, not just a debate between you two guys.

MR. STEVENS: You're not interested in our feelings.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have a problem, and we do have the total legal records, I can assure you, and we know all the entries that have been made. Go ahead.

MR. STEVENS: You have a problem. I may not have made one point clear, Mr. Chairman, and that is the fact that we know that they are going to be entitled to damages and we know it's going to cost money. What I tried to make clear was we would like to have it cost as little money as possible. We therefore feel that there should be some look at how possible change which won't hurt them or would be of minimum damage to them could be made at a minimum cost to us. That's one fundamental thing to study. I hope I made that clear.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Would you like to say something?

MRS. SAARINEN: On page 3 of Mr. Stevens' statement he says, "Is it now aesthetically appropriate? This seems to me the essence of the question rather than any past acts

or conversations." And I think that is our business only. I don't think we're interested in this kind of how much it's going to cost or how much it isn't or what the previous Congress said. Our question is an aesthetic one, and this is ours I think. Therefore, I think this we understand from both points of view.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we will discuss it much further.

MRS. SAARINEN: Right. I don't mean to be rude, but I don't think we should have to listen to the legal debate.

MR. LICHTENBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I just submit a brief filed with the Board of Zoning Adjustment, in answer to many of the legal questions and as to the authorities of these various agencies (handing Chairman Walton a document)?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, we accept it.

(Lichtenberg & Luria, Counsel for Watergate Improvement Associates, submitted a brief, "In the matter of Application of John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Owner, for Lessee and Developer, Watergate Improvement Associates," Appeal No. 9303, memo filed on behalf of the applicant with the Government of the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment.

(Ralph E. Becker, General Counsel, submitted a brief on behalf of John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts on Legal Questions Raised at the Hearing, In the Matter of Appeal of John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. and Watergate Improvement Association, et al., Appeal No. 9303, Government of the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much. I think it is the sense of the Commission to go into Executive Session now.

Mr. Green is the representative for the District Building that issues building licenses and he knows most of our business. If anyone objects to his presence, we can exclude him.

We have our new representative of the Attorney General, Barnes H. Ellis, present, who has not been with us before, but I felt because this was getting so complex, I would always like to have legal advice. You remember we used to have a counsel and don't have any more. Does anyone object to his presence? I think otherwise everyone except those two should leave, if you'll excuse us.

(Mr. Huff, NCPC, withdrew.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have a perfect right to keep it as much in the family as possible.

Now I'd be happy to hear what anyone on the Commission would like to say.

MR. SASAKI: May I see if I can pose this question a little more clearly? It seems as though we have two questions before us: one is this question of whether the building should be built at all, and whether funds can be appropriated to purchase the land.

Now it seems to me that if the Center wants to do this, we really have no objection or, as a matter of fact, no say-so in this matter.

MRS. SAARINEN: Correct.

EXHIBIT G

EXHIBIT G

MR. BUNSHAFT: Want to what?

MRS. SAARINEN: Buy it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Hell, yes! That's not our problem.

MR. SASAKI: We have never had an objection to this, and we stated it was their prerogative to do so. As a matter of fact, it is more than their prerogative: it is none of our business if they want to do this.

Now the second question is whether it looks better with the building in there or not, and that seems to me an irrelevant question. That is like saying should the Washington Monument be higher or lower, you know. It's already an accomplished fact according to the role or the question we should properly consider.

Now I consider that kind of question the same kind as should the Kennedy Center be there at all. Would it be better without it being there? It is an irrelevant question as far as I am concerned. If I express an opinion, it would be only that and would have no official status.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But there is a more procedural approach at the moment. Mr. Stevens technically is asking us whether we will reconsider our position so far. We can say that we do not wish to reconsider our position.

Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: My feeling is we are delighted to hear Mr. Stevens give any additional information, but we stand

with our statement of the previous meeting, and I mean that. In other words, we have listened and it has not affected our oponion one bit. Just what we said last time. This project, as far as we're concerned, was submitted at the proper times, has been submitted again, and we have gone along with the master plan that we agreed to and there is no basis for our doing anything about it. We have reviewed it, criticized it, in the formal process that we have; and there is no reason for us after listening to Mr. Stevens, to do anything but what we did at the last meeting.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, we were aware of everything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Which he knew.

I want to ask Mrs. Saarinen at the moment, because she may leave us.

MRS. SAARINEN: Also I was not here at the other meeting.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would like to get her opinion.

MRS. SAARINEN: I have thought a great deal about it, and I must say that I really agree with the way Hideo stated it. I think if they wish to buy the land, it is not our business to stand in their way.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Our letter said that.

MRS. SAARINEN: Exactly, and I am agreeing with it; but Gordon, could I say it without your interrupting just once, and then I'll leave. Also I agree we had this master plan

and reviewed this thing in the course of it. Whether the Kennedy Center would look better with it there or not, I really think at this point is not our business. We are not in the site planning business of where projects should be placed, and I would go along with the thing you did last time and would add my vote to it. That's all.

I think his statement was very good and very interesting, but I don't think it has brought out anything new.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Walker?

MR. WALKER: I don't know whether this is even appropriate -- but would it be appropriate? I think a good many of us feel if they could buy the land and have a park there, we would actually think the whole site would be more beautiful. That is my feeling. I don't know whether other people would vote on that. I wonder if it would be possible, Mr. Chairman, for me to put a motion which may be voted down, I don't know, that we might say we have certainly no objection to their buying this property and that we actually think the whole complex of buildings would look better without Building No. 1 there.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I see two heads being shaken against this.

MR. WALKER: I'd like to put that as a motion, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Is that appropriate?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You may make any motion you wish.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we are saying in that motion is that we have approved something we don't approve.

MR. WALKER: That's not what I mean.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: May I try to define what you are saying? You are moving that the Commission issue some kind of statement saying that they think the Kennedy Center would be improved by not building Building No. 1.

MRS. SAARINEN: Aesthetically.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And that it was then up to the Kennedy Center to figure out how that could be done. Is that the sense of your motion?

MR. WALKER: Yes, except I'd go a little further. I think the whole site would be improved.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now we want to discuss this motion. Do you have a comment, Mrs. Smith?

MRS. SMITH: Well, I think we said it in the other letter, if anyone wants to buy it, fine; but I'd feel curious though I wasn't here during the whole background of it, to back down on statements and I must say that I get rather upset when Mr. Stevens uses words about martyrdom and so on that I don't think are quite relevant -- martyred President -- to influence things. There is great background on this, and I would stand with our previous decision.

MR. SASAKI: I think we've always said this, said the site was too small. We always said it was surrounded by high buildings and I don't think there is any, you know, lack of facts, evidence or something that this may be true; but to me i is not a relevant question. I mean that it seems to me that by making such a statement we are lending credence in a way or support to say Mr. Stevens group -- I don't know whether they want to penalize the Watergate Project, but it seems otme this statement we made to them originally and they elected not to exercise their option in following our advice and purchasing that land.

So the same set of options still exists. The land has not been built upon, and they can still purchase it. It seems to me we said it once before. I don't think it would be proper for us to restate this in a resolution at this particular time, which would tend to lend witness to one side or the other. That is where my sense of conscience enters.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we have all spoken, and we should put Mr. Walker's motion to a vote.

MR. WALKER: It hasn't been seconded.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Would anyone care to second his motion?

(No response)

MR. WALKER: I've done the best I can on that. I would

like to answer that, if I may, for one minute. My motion dies without a second, but it seems to me that our responsibility is to make the most beautiful city we can of Washington. That is all my fundamental thought is. We are here to try to keep the city as beautiful as possible.

Now if the city would be more beautiful without that building, and if due compensation were paid to the Watergate group, it would seem to me our responsibility is to say we think, in our aesthetic judgment, the site would be more beautiful without the building than with the building. It seems to me to be our responsibility.

MRS. SAARINEN: If I may say so, it seems to me you are making a multiple choice here, a piggy-back thing. First of all, let's take them in separate parts. I think everybody is very clear we have gone and taken the step we should which is to say to the Kennedy Center, "If you want to go and buy this, this is up to you. This is not our business." Now if you wish off the record or in a letter to discuss, which I don't think is our business because this is a fait accompli and this is a fait accompli, I'm not convinced even in my own point of view we are making Washington a more beautiful city because of the highways and the whole site and a million reasons, so I don't think we necessarily agree this would enhance and make it a more dignified, beautiful center; but I don't really think that is the issue, but you keep putting them together where they don't belong in our function at the moment.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is all academic, but what is wrong here is the Center, not the housing is what's wrong, so what you are doing is trying to patch up a mess.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now Mr. Stevens has made a request to us, and I think it is proper that we give him a reply of some kind. We can conceivably take it under advisement and not send him a reply until after our next meeting. However, if you wish to make a reply to him, I am open to suggestions of what the reply should be.

Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'd say what I said earlier, that we are glad to listen to Mr. Stevens and after hearing what he had to say, we feel what we wrote in our letter of last month, or whatever it is, we feel exactly the same.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Would you like to make that in the form of a motion?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: I second it.

MR. WALKER: Would you be willing to have that letter also say --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Our letter says we don't object if they want to acquire the land.

MR. WALKER: That's what our original letter says?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes, without any comment whether it

would be better or worse, which we shouldn't do.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If there is no further discussion, all in favor signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of "ayes.")

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Opposed?

MR. WALKER: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is four to one in favor of such a reply.

Is there any further business? If not, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:05 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

14 November 1967

Dear Mr. Stevens:

After careful study of your statement and all of the related material, the Commission of Fine Arts voted against reconsidering its decision in regard to Watergate Building Number 1 as set forth at its September meeting.

In my letter of September 21st to the Executive Director of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, I said that the Commission "wishes to emphasize that today's action should not be permitted to affect efforts of the Kennedy Center trustees and other interested parties to acquire Watergate land adjacent to the Kennedy Center."

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Roger L. Stevens
Chairman, Board of Trustees
John F. Kennedy Center for the
Performing Arts
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20566

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 November 1967

AM
10:15

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
   Executive Session: 19 December 1967
   Open Session: 20 December 1967

2. Approval of Minutes of October 1967 Meeting

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

   Discussion of Height of Building No. 1, Watergate Development

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden - Revised Designs

   b. F.B.I. Building - Confirmation of Approved Design

   c. Pennsylvania Avenue Annex and Great Plaza Parking Facility - Allocation of Funds

   d. Selection of Sculptor for Courthouse and F.O.B., Philadelphia, Pa.

3. Department of the Navy

   Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Final Design Studies

4. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

   Arlington National Cemetery:
   a. Administrative Building - Proposed Design
   b. Memorial Chapel - Proposed Design
   c. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater - Proposed Alterations

5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

   Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas Place - Revised Design

6. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint
Medal Commemorating 100th Anniversary of the First Transcontinental Railroad (Golden Spike Society)-Proposed Design

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 68-19, 900 Maine Ave., S.W. - Floating Restaurant

(2) Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2

IV. INTERVIEWS

11:45 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden - Revised Design

12:00 2. Department of the Navy

Defense Office Building, Bolling/Anacostia - Final Design Studies

12:30 3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Arlington National Cemetery:
a. Administrative Building - Proposed Design
b. Memorial Chapel - Proposed Design
c. Arlington Memorial Amphitheater - Proposed Alterations

12:45 4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas Place - Revised Design

LUNCH

2:30 5. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

Discussion of Height of Building No. 1, Watergate Development

Jun 23, 2017